

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

l	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
_	10/695,298	10/28/2003	Toshiyuki Baba	42479-8100	4183	
	21611 SNFLL & WII	7590 · 02/22/2007 LMER LLP (OC)		EXAMINER		
600 ANTON BOULEVARD				WATTS, ALLISON LEIGH		
	SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA	A, CA 92626		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		•		1753		
_						
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS		DAYS	02/22/2007	PAP	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

/	
\sim	
0	

		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/695,2	98	BABA, TOSHIYUKI				
Office Action Summary			г	Art Unit				
		Allison L.	Watts	1753				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on th	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING INSIDE OF THE MAILING INSIDE OF THE MAILING INSIDE OF THE OF THE MAILING INSIDE OF THE OF	G DATE OF T R 1.136(a). In no e n. eriod will apply and v tatute, cause the ap	HIS COMMUNICATION yent, however, may a reply be timused will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from plication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	28 January 20	03.					
, —	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)	Since this application is in condition for all	olication is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the applica	tion.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from co	onsideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)[Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> are subject to restriction and	l/or election re	quirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the B	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s)	be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	rrection is requi	red if the drawing(s) is obj	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. N	ote the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 							
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum		• • •					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the	•		ed in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* 9	See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the cer	ified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachmen			4) [] Intended 2000	(PTO 412)				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 🔲 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	•	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application				
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date		6)	•				

Application/Control Number: 10/695,298

Art Unit: 1753

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-3, drawn to a method of making, classified in class 65, subclass
 153.
 - II. Claim 4, drawn to a method of making, classified in class 65, subclass153.
 - III. Claims 5-11, drawn to a product, classified in class 204, subclass 416.
- 2. Inventions Group I and Group II are directed to related processes of making. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the method of Group I as claimed could be used to make a different product other than the ion measuring device as described in Group II. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.
- 3. Inventions Group I and Group III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially

different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product of Group III could be made using a different method other than the welding method as described in Group I. Also, the method of Group I could be used to make a materially different product other than the ion measuring device as described in Group III.

- 4. Inventions Group II and Group III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product of Group III could be made using a different method other than the welding method as described in Group III.
- 5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their

Application/Control Number: 10/695,298

Art Unit: 1753

recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. A telephone call was made to Joseph Price on 2/6/07 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allison L. Watts whose telephone number is (571) 272-6640. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/695,298 Page 5

Art Unit: 1753

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ALW 2/9/2007

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700